



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,143	12/27/2000	Janice Renwick	088305-0130	3291

7590

11/30/2005

William T. Ellis
FOLEY & LARDNER
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20007-5109

EXAMINER

CHARLES, DEBRA F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3624

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,143

Applicant(s)

RENWICK ET AL.

Examiner

Debra F. Charles

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-14 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1, 11 and 14 have been amended. Claims 2-3 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards(6408303B1), Reed et al.(5862325A) and Kotamarti(USPUB 2001/0043234A1).

Re claims 1, 13 and 14: Richards disclose a method for processing an inbound document received from a trading partner in a business-to-

business electronic commerce data processing system(Abstract, col. 2, line 60- col. 3, line 1-55), the method comprising the steps of :

storing templates for automatically creating trading partner profiles(col. 3, lines 15-25),

receiving an inbound document from a trading partner(col. 3, lines 30-55),

creating a profile by retrieving a template associated with the inbound document(col. 3, lines 1-67);

reading the template to determine what data is to be extracted from

the inbound document and extracting said data(col. 6, lines 35-65, col. 8, lines 1-20); and

creating a profile record for the trading partner in the profile database and populating said profile record with said extracted data(col. 7, lines 35-50).

Richards disclose the invention except determining if a profile for said trading partner is stored in a profile database. However, in col. 37, line 60- col. 38, line 15, thereof Reed et al. disclose if the received object is not a message object, the next step is determining whether the communications object already exists in the consumer database. This is done by querying the consumer database for the UID of the communications object. If the UID does not exist, the object is processed as a new object. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Richards based on the teachings of Reed et al. The motivation to combine these

references is it performs the check feature to see if the profile object already exists before creating a new object.

Richards disclose the invention except wherein the profile is automatically created only if an auto-creation flag is preset, and wherein the system stores an auto-creation flag for each of a plurality of interworking standards, and the system determined the relevant standard associated with the received inbound document and determines if there is an auto-creation flag set for the determined standard. In Fig. 3, 5, 7, 8, para 0080-0092, Kotamarti disclose a preset flag that performs a function and determining whether there is an instruction already set up(para 0091). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Richards based on the teachings of Kotamarti. The motivation to combine these references is it performs the check feature to see if the profile object already exists before creating a new object.

5. Claim 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards, Reed et al. and Kotamarti as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of LeCrone et al.(6662197B1).

Re claims 4 and 5: Richards, Reed et al. and Kotamarti disclose the invention except the auto-creation flag is stored in an exception flag dataset. However, in claims 4 and 29, thereof LeCrone et al. disclose 4. A method as recited in claim 2 wherein said recording step includes storing in an other dataset an identification of the time interval, data group and the defined flags. And claim 29. Apparatus as recited in claim 27 wherein said collector application includes means for storing in an other dataset an identification of the time interval, data group and all the defined flags. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Richards, Reed et al. and Kotamarti based on the teachings of LeCrone et

al. The motivation to combine these references is to store variously defined flags that indicate different statuses.

6. Claims 6,7,8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards, Reed et al. and Kotamarti as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Webber(6418400B1).

Re claims 6, 7, 8 and 9: Richards, Reed et al. and Kotamarti disclose the invention except there is at least one interchange template, and each such template is associated with an interworking interchange envelope, at least one functional group template, and each such template is associated with a functional group envelope, and least one message template, and each such template is associated with a message envelope, and interworking standard and specific message type, and a standard with any version, and any version and any message for a specific standard. However, in the Abstract, col. 1, lines 15-30, col. 2, lines 50-67, col. 6, lines 25-45, Webber disclose different types of templates to deal with different types of data message formats. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Richards, Reed et al. and Kotamarti based on the teachings of Webber. The motivation to combine these references is to enable the use of different network interchange protocols.

7. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards, Reed et al., Kotamarti, LeCrone et al. and Webber.

Re claim 11: Richards disclose method for processing an inbound document received from a trading partner in a business-to-business electronic commerce data processing system(Abstract, col. 2, line 60- col. 3, line 1-55), the method comprising the steps of :

storing templates for automatically creating trading partner profiles(col. 3, lines 15-25),

receiving an inbound document from a trading partner(col. 3, lines 30-55),

automatically creating a profile(col. 3, lines 1-67) by:

retrieving a template associated with the inbound document(col. 6, lines 35-65, col. 8, lines 1-20);

reading the template to determine what data is to be extracted from

the inbound document and extracting said data(col. 6, lines 35-65, col. 8, lines 1-20); and

creating a profile record for the trading partner in the profile database and populating said profile record with said extracted data(col. 7, lines 35-50).

Richards disclose the invention except determining if a profile for said trading partner is stored in a profile database. However, in col. 37, line 60- col. 38, line 15, thereof Reed et al. disclose if the received object is not a message object, the next step is determining whether the communications object already exists in the consumer database. This is done by querying the consumer database for the UID of the communications object. If the UID does not exist, the object is processed as a new object. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Richards based on the teachings of Reed et al. The motivation to combine these references is it performs the check feature to see if the profile object already exists before creating a new object.

Richards and Reed et al. disclose the invention except an auto-creation flag is pre-set. However, in col. 9, Lines 30-45, thereof Kotamarti disclose if the host application assumes that the MDT flag for that field was pre-set to begin with. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Richards and Reed et al. based on the teachings of Kotamarti. The motivation to combine these references is it performs the check feature to see if the profile object already exists before creating a new object.

Richards, Reed et al. and Kotamarti disclose the invention except the auto-creation flag is stored in an exception flag dataset. However, in claims 4 and 29, thereof LeCrone et al. disclose 4. A method as recited in claim 2 wherein said recording step includes storing in an other dataset an identification of the time interval, data group and the defined flags. And claim 29. Apparatus as recited in claim 27 wherein said collector application includes means for storing in an other dataset an identification of the time interval, data group and all the defined flags. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Richards, Reed et al. and Kotamarti based on the teachings of LeCrone et al. The motivation to combine these references is to store variously defined flags that indicate different statuses.

Richards disclose the invention except wherein the profile is automatically created only if an auto-creation flag is preset, and wherein the system stores an auto-creation flag for each of a plurality of interworking standards, and the system determined the relevant standard associated with the received inbound document and determines if there is an auto-creation flag set for the determined standard. In Fig. 3, 5, 7, 8, para 0080-0092, Kotamarti disclose a preset flag that performs a function and determining whether there is an instruction already set up(para 0091). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Richards based on the teachings of Kotamarti. The motivation to combine these references is it performs the check feature to see if the profile object already exists before creating a new object.

Richards, Reed et al., Kotamarti and LeCrone et al. disclose the invention except there is at least one interchange template, and each such template is associated with an interworking interchange envelope, at least one functional group template, and each such template is associated with a functional group envelope, and least one message template, and each such template is associated with a message envelope, and interworking standard and specific message type, and a standard with any version, and any version and any message for a specific standard. However, in the Abstract, col. 1, lines 15-30, col. 2, lines 50-67, col. 6, lines 25-45, Webber disclose different types of templates to deal with different types of data message formats. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Richards, Reed et al., Kotamarti and LeCrone et al.

based on the teachings of Webber. The motivation to combine these references is to enable the use of different network interchange protocols.

Re claim 12: Richards, Reed et al., Kotamarti and LeCrone et al. disclose the invention except templates are retrieved from a map component file associated with the interworking standard of the inbound document.

However, in the Abstract, col. 1, lines 15-30, col. 2, lines 50-67, col. 6, lines 25-45, Fig. 7, items 21, 22, 23 7A, item 38 Webber disclose different types of templates to deal with different types of data message formats. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Richards, Reed et al., Kotamarti and LeCrone et al. based on the teachings of Webber. The motivation to combine these references is to enable the use of different network interchange protocols and associate them with the right connections.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards and Reed et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Webber and Pasetes, Jr. et al. (5202977A).

Re claim 10: Richards and Reed et al. disclose the invention except template is associated with a stored template record, and the step of reading the template to determine data to be extracted. However, in the Abstract, col. 1, lines 15-30, col. 2, lines 50-67, col. 6, lines 25-45, Fig.7, items 21, 22, 23 7A, item 38, Figure 9 steps E through steps H, Webber disclose different types of templates to deal with different types of data message formats. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Richards and Reed et al. based on the teachings of Webber. The motivation to combine these references is to enable the use of different network interchange protocols and associate them with the right connections.

Richards, Reed et al. and Webber disclose the invention except a key having a substitution label and a value, said substitution label being associated with a value entry field of the template, and wherein: comprises assigning the label to a variable name of the inbound document, and said variable name is read from the inbound document. However, in col. 5, lines 10-55, thereof, Pasetes, Jr. et al. disclose the third, or current, generation of translation software attempts to provide higher levels of transform capability so that an EDI document can be put into a form closer to the input required by the user's integrated application software. These translators provide for table-driven systems and "dynamic mapping." Dynamic mapping allows the user to identify the relationship of elements within a segment to fields in an application input document and vice versa. Instead of fixing record lengths, the systems allow the user to put data elements into different data files in any location. Rather than being limited to a single fixed length file in a transaction set, the user can select data

from multiple files, in any order within the file, and present the data to the translator. The ACS Network Systems EDI 4XX product, available from ACS Network Systems of Concord, Calif., is typical of third generation software products. The data communication component of ACS 4XX provides the means to generate and maintain a communication line directly with a trading partner or to a third party data network and the means to control the process of sending and receiving documents to and from trading partners. The translation component of ACS 4XX translates incoming standard business documents from an EDI Standard format to a format usable by applications programs and reverses the process for outgoing data.

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Debra F. Charles whose telephone number is (571) 272 6791. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5 Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent A. Millin can be reached on (571) 272 6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Debra F. Charles

Application/Control Number: 09/748,143
Art Unit: 3624

Page 13

Examiner
Art Unit 3624

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Hani M. Kazimi', with a stylized flourish at the end.

HANI M. KAZIMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER